REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1-3 and 7-9 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 4-6 and 10-18 have been rejected. Claims 4 and 10 have been amended, as supported by paragraphs 0022 to 0025 and Figures 1 to 4. Claim 7, 9 and 12 are amended consistent with the amendments to claim 10. Claims 1-18 remain in the case.

Applicant respectfully requests that the foregoing amendments be made prior to further examination of the present application, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the reasons that follow. This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, along with appropriate defined status identifiers.

It is noted that the withdrawn claims are process claims directed to a method of using the elected apparatus. Under the doctrine of *In re Ochiai*, process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of a patentable product claim are properly rejoined and examined with the product claims once allowable product claims have been indicated. Applicant has amended process claim 7 consistent with the amendment to claim 10, so that the criteria for rejoinder apply. Accordingly, the process claims remain in the case for reconsideration once an allowable apparatus claim has been indicated.

A replacement sheet of drawing for Figure 5 is appended, which includes the legend requested by the examiner.

In response to applicant's arguments that there was no suggestion in the combination of references that the material introducing part is connected to an exhauster that is independent to that of the vacuum chamber, the examiner has added a new reference, Iida (JP 10-092800), to the prior rejections. Thus, claims 4 and 10 now are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawai (JP 2002-249868) taken in view of Iida (JP 10-092800). The examiner urges that Kawai discloses in Fig. 1 and paragraphs 0021-0032 an organic EL thin film manufacturing apparatus comprising a vapor deposition apparatus comprising a line source 62 positioned in a vacuum chamber 20, said vacuum chamber being connected to a first exhauster 10, a material introducing part 30 positioned inside of said vacuum chamber, wherein a vapor-state organic material is fed into the line source from the material introducing part to form a thin film of the organic material on a substrate disposed inside the vacuum chamber. The examiner admits that Kawai *et al.* does not teach the

material introducing part is positioned outside the vacuum chamber, and in the material introducing part the pressure can be set independently of the pressure in said vacuum chamber, said material introducing part being connected to a second exhauster. He cites Iida as teaching a deposition apparatus comprising a material introducing part 1 positioned outside a vacuum chamber 15 with a first exhauster (valve 14) and where the material introducing part 1 has a second exhauster (valve 13) that enables to obtain sublimation refining of the deposition raw material, citing Figs. 1 and 2 and paragraphs 0013-0032).

It is noted that valve 14 of Iida is not an exhauster valve. Valve 14 connects evaporation source I with the monomer nozzle ("The evaporation source Ib was connected with the monomer nozzle in the vacuum treatment chamber of an omni-directional vapor-deposition-polymerization device (Japan vacuum-technology incorporated company make and trade name VEP3040) via the valve 14"). Therefore, the characterization of valve 14 in Iida as a first exhauster is inaccurate.

Furthermore, Iida does not employ a line source, the examiner relying on Kawai for this feature. Thus, the examiner is alleging that it would have been obvious to use the exhaust arrangement of Iida in a device of Kawai. In applicant's previous response, it was explained that Kawai does not disclose a line source. Claims 4 and 10 now have been amended to more particularly recite the line source as "comprising (i) a gas distributing pipe distributing the vapor state organic material fed from the material introducing part throughout the line source, (ii) a blocking plate having a number of holes, said blocking plate covering the gas distributing pipe, and (iii) heating means for heating the gas distributing pipe and the blocking plate." Kawai does not disclose a line source as recited in applicant's claims, and therefore no *prima facie* case of obviousness exists based on the combination of Kawai and Iida. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawai *et al.* (2002-249868) in view of Iida (JP 10-092800) as applied to claims 4 and 10 and further in view of Van Slyke (US 2003/0203638). The examiner admits that Kawai *et al.* in view of Iida do not teach crucible fixing means for holding the crucible. He urges that Van Slyke teaches deposition apparatus comprising a vacuum chamber 130, a material introduction source 500VS disposed outside the vacuum chamber and a crucible holding means 525 for supporting the crucible (.e.g. Fig. 4 and para. 0047-0060). Van Slyke does not overcome the failure of Kawai and Iida to suggest an arrangement in which separate exhaust means are used for the deposition chamber and material introducing part in a device which uses a line source as presently claimed. Indeed, the applicant relied upon Van Slyke in combination with Kawai in his rejection of claim 4, and withdrew that rejection in light of applicant's

arguments. No *prima facie* case of obviousness exists based on the combination of Kawai, Iida and Van Slyke, and reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 6 and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawai *et al.* (2002-249868) in view of Iida (JP 10-092800) as applied to claims 4 and 10 and further in view of Grace *et al.* (US 2004/0144321). The examiner admits that neither Kawai et al. nor Iida teaches a line source which has a blocking plate for dispersing the vapor state organic material that has been fed therein, and said blocker plate is temperature controlled. He cites Grace *et al.* for this feature. Grace *et al.* does not overcome the failure of Kawai and Iida to suggest an arrangement in which separate exhaust means are used for the deposition chamber and material introducing part in a device which uses a line source as presently claimed. No *prima facie* case of obviousness exists based on the combination of Kawai, Iida and Grace, and reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

It is noted that Kawai and Iida were cited during the prosecution of the Japanese counterpart of this case, and that claims corresponding in scope to the present claims were allowed in the Japanese case and issued in JP4013859.

If there are any problems with this response, or if the examiner believes that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application, Applicant's attorney would appreciate a telephone call. In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

JUNE 25, 2009
DATE

/BARBARA A. MCDOWELL/
BARBARA A. MCDOWELL
REG. NO. 31,640

20609 GORDON PARK SQUARE, SUITE 150
ASHBURN, VA 20147
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)